

Published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per annum, payable strictly in advance.

In St. Louis, Canada, and in foreign countries, \$2.10.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103,

Act of October 3, 1917, authorized October 5, 1918.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Published by the

Evangelical Lutheran Synod

of

Missouri, Ohio, and Other States.

Vol. VII. — DECEMBER, 1927.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,

ST. LOUIS, MO.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Edited by the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

PROF. W. ARNDT, *Managing Editor pro tem.*, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Items whose authorship is not indicated are by the managing editor
pro tem.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Lutherans at Lausanne	353
Why Was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing Before the Diet?	365
The Theological Observer	378
Book Review	381

Please Take Notice.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Dec 27" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Published by the

Evangelical Lutheran Synod
of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States.

VOLUME VII.



ST. LOUIS, MO.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1927.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VII.

DECEMBER, 1927.

No. 12.

The Lutherans at Lausanne.

The movement to bring about closer relations among the churches along the lines of unionism, and eventually a union, which was inaugurated at the World Conference on Missions in Edinburgh in 1910 and at the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the same year and was supported by other American denominations, notably the Disciples and Congregationalists, gathered its forces this year in the World Conference on Faith and Order, which assembled August 3 at Lausanne, Switzerland, and sat for three weeks. Four hundred and thirty-five delegates attended, representing eighty-one communions, or groups. The only bodies not represented were the Roman Catholics and a branch of the Baptists (called in America the Southern Baptists). "Representatives from all the continents and many islands of the sea were there — patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, deans, canons, professors, executives, editors, ministers, priests, missionaries, and seven women." Bishop Charles H. Brent of Western New York, who has been a prime mover in this affair since the Edinburgh conference, presided, Professor Garvie (Congregationalist) being deputy chairman. The vice-presidents were Archbishop Soederblom, Archbishop Germanos, Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, and Professor Deissmann (of the University of Berlin). The object of the conference, says the preamble by Bishop Brent in the official report of the meetings, "is to register the apparent fundamental agreements within the conference and the grave points of disagreements remaining; also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement." Seven subjects occupied the minds of the conference, all of which, except the first, were thoroughly discussed. "Each subject (of the six) on the agenda was first discussed in plenary session. It was then committed to one of the sections, of more than one hundred members each, into which the whole conference was divided. The report, after full discussion in subsections, was

finally drawn up and adopted unanimously or by a large majority vote by the section to which it had been committed. It was twice presented for further discussion to a plenary session of the conference. Thence it was referred to the churches in its present form. . . . We thank God and rejoice over agreements reached; upon our agreements we build. Where the reports record differences, we call upon the Christian world to an earnest reconsideration of the conflicting opinions now held and a strenuous endeavor to reach the truth as it is in God's mind, which should be the foundation of the Church's unity." (Preamble.)

What stand did the Lutherans take at the conference?

"Press reports have indicated that Lutheran delegates were of great influence in the conference." (*Lutheran*). The delegation of the United Lutheran Church had invited all the Lutheran delegates to a meeting on the evening of August 3 to consider the position to be taken on the important matters before the conference. About 60 attended. They discussed the questions: 1) What can the Lutherans do for the movement called Faith and Order? 2) What can the Lutherans do for the closer cooperation among the Lutherans in all lands? Archbishop Soederblom, says a Swedish journal, emphasized the responsibility which to-day rests upon Lutheranism to administer rightly its Reformation inheritance. Dr. Sherer, of the U. L. C., reports that those gathered there were of the opinion that the Lutheran Church has a contribution to make to the movement for unity and that they were desirous of making it. — The statement of the Swedish journal, reproduced by the *Lutheran*: "This meeting can, without exaggeration, be called historical, as the whole Lutheran Christendom of both the Old and the New World was here represented," contains an exaggeration. For instance, no delegate was authorized to speak for the Synodical Conference.

The first subject presented to the conference was the

Call to Unity.

It was not discussed by the sections and subsections, but brought before the conference through addresses by leading men of the Lutheran, Reformed, and Orthodox churches. Dr. W. Elert, of Erlangen, said among other things: "We dare not hold fellowship with error. Truth and error cannot make peace with each other. Where the truth is at stake, there can be no compromise. . . . Our wish for this council is that it may discover the unity of the Christians in the truth and that it may announce the truth by

definite findings without compromise with error. . . . Our chief confession teaches: 'It suffices for the true unity of the Church to be one in the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. And it is not necessary that the human traditions or ceremonies which have been established by men should everywhere be alike.' We welcome the attempt to seek the unity of Christians in unanimity in the teaching of the Gospel. For we know from history that there are also surrogates of unity which deceive, where the true unity of Christians, the unity in the truth, does not exist. . . . Therefore our third wish for this council is that the differences in organization and rites may not form a hindrance to gaining that unity which we are seeking in the truth. . . . It should be easy enough to find theological expressions of compromise which might call for the consent of all of us or at least many of us. But these formulas are worthless if the great church-bodies to which we belong cannot find their faith and their knowledge of truth in them. Our assent to the coming formulas will have value only in so far as we can really speak for the churches which we represent."

The conference was thus made acquainted with the principle enunciated in Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession. It was told in plain Lutheran language that it would be a waste of time to aim at effecting unity on the basis of the sameness of "rites or ceremonies" and of "order," that agreement in the doctrine of Scripture constitutes the true unity of the Church, and that the Lutheran Church will make no compromise with error. — Those portions of the address which denied the Lutheran principles will be touched upon later.

Report of Section II. The Church's Message to the World — the Gospel.

(Received by the full conference, *nem. con.*, August 19, 1927.)

"1) The message of the Church to the world is, and always must remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ. 2) The Gospel is the joyous message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ. 3) The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's Spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old Testament; and in the fulness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth. 4) Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of

the coming of the kingdom of God and of Judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit He has brought to us forgiveness of sins and has revealed the fulness of the living God and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men. 5) Jesus Christ, as the Crucified and the Living One, as Savior and Lord, is also the center of the world-wide Gospel of the apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a theological system; more than a program for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer, and of praise. 6) The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer; to those who are bound it is assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to the heart and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service, and compassionate love. It offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth, strength to the toiler, rest to the weary, and the crown of life to the martyr. 7) The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society at present into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord. 8) Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past, so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men: 'Come unto Me. . . . He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

No Lutheran can accept these theses on the Gospel. The Gospel here described is not the Gospel confessed in the Lutheran

symbols, proclaimed in the Bible. The vicarious satisfaction rendered by Christ and justification by faith are not as much as mentioned. That is the chief article of the Christian religion. Every adherent of the Augsburg Confession recognizes it as "the chief topic of Christian doctrine." (Apology. *Trigl.*, p. 121.) And as the fathers declared when preparing for a World Conference on Faith, he declares to-day: "Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth and whatever will not abide, should sink to ruin." (Smalcald Articles. *Trigl.*, p. 461.) The Church that adopts these Lausanne Articles surrenders everything of the chief article. These articles teach a way of salvation which is not that of justification by faith. The representatives of the Orthodox Church did not hesitate to subscribe to these articles. Dr. Peter Ainslie, editor of the *Christian Union Quarterly*, writes in the *Christian Century*: "The Eastern Orthodox delegation asked to be excused from voting on the other reports; but they heartily supported this one." They found nothing in it to conflict with their doctrine of justification by works. Any Ritschlian will heartily subscribe to Article 4. And the two Roman Catholic priests who were present as unofficial observers could have subscribed with a clear conscience to the statement: "The Gospel is the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ." It is the modern social gospel which the United Church of the future is asked to spread, not the Gospel of the forgiveness of sins for the sake of Christ. Article 8 has a lot to say of the longing for intellectual sincerity and the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Its great need, the forgiveness of sins, is not met by the United Church. Article 4 does indeed speak of forgiveness of sins. Ritschl and Hermann also speak of it — in their sense. And what sense would you connect with the statement: "Through His call to repentance . . . Christ has brought to us forgiveness of sins"? The articles abound with indefinite phrases, of a rhetorical nature and often entirely meaningless, but there is no clear-cut statement on the nature of the Gospel, its gracious offer of the righteousness gained by Christ. How does Dr. Ainslie interpret them? He finds the Gospel described therein as "the prophetic call to sinful men to turn to God as the only way by which humanity can escape" — from what? — "from those class and race hatreds which devastate society and fulfil humanity's longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspiration." No Lutheran is going to subscribe to Section II.

The Lutheran members of Section II, of which Professor

Deissmann was the convener, failed to bring Lutheranism into play effectively. Bound to administer the Reformation inheritance, they were under obligation to bring in articles clearly and firmly setting forth the article of justification by faith. It was not sufficient that the U. L. C. delegation distributed 500 copies of the Augsburg Confession and the Smalcald Articles. It was not sufficient that Dr. Sherer stressed, in an address before the plenary session, the importance of this article: "If this sacerdotal theory be accepted and consistently carried out . . . , Christ is no longer the sole Mediator between God and man, the universal priesthood of believers is degraded to an inferior position, and the doctrine of justification alone by faith in Christ, which Luther called 'the article of a standing or a falling church,' is thereby endangered, if not surrendered." That surely was the voice of Lutheranism. But the voice of Lutheranism was silenced when the section formulated its report. The reports on the other subjects register, clearly and unmistakably, disagreements. Dr. Sherer states in an interview published in the *Lutheran* that the purpose of the conference was to "bring into relief some of the most radical differences which obstruct the way of union." Disagreements on the church, the ministry, etc., are brought out, but no disagreement on the chief article. The observer sent by the *Lutheran Church Herald* states that "according to the rules of the convention any group with particular convictions can arrange to have that brought out in the meeting." The convictions of the Lutherans were not brought out in the report of Section II. "Received by the full conference, *nem. con.*" There were serious clashes on relatively minor points. The clash should have set in right here. And if the section refused to incorporate the protest of the Lutherans into their report, the Lutherans were bound to sever all connection with this section. "Of this article nothing can be yielded, even though heaven and earth" and Section II "should sink to ruin."

Even though the whole World Conference should sink to ruin. The Lutherans might conceivably have waited to see what action the plenary session would take and, to bring about action, bring their protest before the entire body. In a manner that was done. In a manner — because the protest was not strong enough and because it was not reenforced by the requisite action. It could not have been strong enough because it did not make much of an impression. Dr. Ainslie records the vehement protest raised by the Anglo-Catholics in the matter of Subject VII, but not a word on a protest in the matter of Subject II. The preamble by Bishop Brent creates

the impression that there was unanimity in the conference on Subject II. It so impresses Dr. Zoellner as set forth in the *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung*. And a letter by Bishop Brent states: "The most important thing is that unanimity was brought about in the matter of the message of the Church to the world, the message of the Gospel, since every delegate heartily accepted the report on this subject." It must have escaped the attention of Bishop Brent that the disagreement voiced by the Lutherans referred also to Section II. The fact is that the Lutherans voiced their disagreement. We hasten to give this fact all the publicity we can because the readers of the official report cannot but get the impression that there was unanimity on this point and because some Lutheran publications have failed to report this important development. Dr. Sherer's interview, for instance, does not mention it. It was with great pleasure that we read of it in the *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung*. The declaration of the Lutherans, presented to the plenary session, signed in the name of the Lutheran delegates by L. Appia of France, P. Hognestad of Norway, M. G. G. Sherer of America, N. Soederblom of Sweden, A. Steimle of America, W. Zoellner of Germany states: ". . . It is, according to our Confessions, not necessary for the unity of the churches that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies be everywhere alike; but it is necessary that there be unity in the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. . . . 2. Accordingly, no definitive vote on the articles here formulated should be taken. They should be published in the report merely as material for future discussions." The Norwegian delegation, with the exception of Bishop Hognestad of Bergen, was willing, partly through a misconception, to accept the articles on Subject II. But the official declaration of the Lutherans, as presented to the conference, clearly shows that the Lutherans took a stand on this subject different from that of the Orthodox Church. However, the conference somehow failed to see that. That being so, it was the duty of the Lutherans to reenforce their declaration by unmistakable action. An ultimatum, if rejected, must be followed by the severance of relations. The very least the World Conference Lutherans can do with reference to this point is to demand that the conference acknowledge the vital disagreement on the article of justification existing among the participants.

For that purpose it would become necessary to draw up articles that set forth the Lutheran position as clearly and strongly as possible — along the lines, say, of the Apology and the Smalcald

Articles, with the additional reference, however, to the grave errors of modern Protestants on this point. And here lies the fatal weakness in the Lutheran declaration. It is willing to use the articles of Section II as material for future discussions. But these articles are absolutely unfit for that purpose. Articles so flagrantly unscriptural as these cannot yield material for fruitful discussions. It never entered the minds of the fathers at Smalcald to present articles for discussion at the proposed general council which embodied the views of the Roman Catholics. The Lutheran declaration at Lausanne certainly cannot mean that their sole purpose in bringing up and discussing these articles is to reject them. It means that they contain, in their view, germs that might be made to develop into a Scriptural presentation of the doctrine of the Gospel. The declaration should have informed the conference that the mind of the Lutheran Church is already made up on these articles, that it looks upon them with abhorrence.

Report of Section III — The Nature of the Church.

(Received by the full conference, *nem. con.*, August 19, 1927.)

“God, who has given us the Gospel for the salvation of the world, has appointed His Church to witness by life and word to its redeeming power. The Church of the living God is constituted by His own will, not by the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, though He uses the will of men as His instrument. Of this Church Jesus Christ is the Head, the Holy Spirit its continuing life.

“The Church as the communion of believers in Christ Jesus is, according to the New Testament, the people of the New Covenant, the body of Christ, and the temple of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone.

“The Church is God’s chosen instrument, by which Christ, through the Holy Spirit, reconciles men to God through faith, bringing their wills into subjection to His sovereignty, sanctifying them through the means of grace, and uniting them in love and service to be His witnesses and fellow-workers in the extension of His rule on earth until His kingdom come in glory.

“As there is but one Christ and one life in Him and one Holy Spirit, who guides into all truth, so there is, and can be, but one Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

“The Church on earth possesses certain characteristics whereby

it can be known of men. These have been, since the days of the apostles, at least the following:—

“1) The possession and acknowledgment of the Word of God as given in Holy Scripture and interpreted by the Holy Spirit to the Church and to the individual (a);

“2) The profession of faith in God as He is incarnate and revealed in Christ;

“3) The acceptance of Christ’s commission to preach the Gospel to every creature;

“4) The observance of the Sacraments;

“5) A ministry for the pastoral office, the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the Sacraments;

“6) A fellowship in prayer, in worship, in all the means of grace, in the pursuit of holiness, and in the service of man.

“As to the extent and manner in which the Church thus described finds expression in the existing churches, we differ. Our differences chiefly concern:—

“1) The nature of the Church Visible and the Church Invisible, their relation to each other, and the number of those who are included in each (b);

“2) The significance of our divisions past and present (c).

“Whatever our views on these points, we are convinced that it is the will of Christ that the one life of the one body should be manifest to the world. To commend the Gospel to doubting, sinful, and bewildered men, a united witness is necessary. We therefore urge most earnestly that all Christians, in fulfilment of our Savior’s prayer that His disciples may be one, reconsecrate themselves to God, that by the help of His Spirit the body of Christ may be built up, its members united in faith and love, and existing obstacles to the manifestation of their unity in Christ may be removed; that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him.

“We join in the prayer that the time may be hastened when in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

NOTES.

“a) Some hold that this interpretation is given through the tradition of the Church; others, through the immediate witness of the Spirit to the heart and conscience of the believers; others, through both combined.

“b) For instance:—

“1) Some hold that the invisible Church is wholly in heaven;

others include in it all true believers on earth, whether contained in any organization or not.

"2) Some hold that the visible expression of the Church was determined by Christ Himself and is therefore unchangeable; others, that the one Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms.

"3) Some hold that one or other of the existing churches is the only true Church; others, that the Church as we have described it is to be found in some or all of the existing communions taken together.

"4) Some, while recognizing other Christian bodies as churches, are persuaded that in the providence of God and by the teaching of history, a particular form of ministry has been shown to be necessary to the best welfare of the Church; others hold that no one form of organization is inherently preferable; still others, that no organization is necessary.

"c) One view is that no division of Christendom has ever come to pass without sin. Another view is that the divisions were the inevitable outcome of different gifts of the Spirit and different understanding of the truth. Between these, there is the view of those who look back on the divisions of the past with penitence and sorrow, coupled with a lively sense of God's mercy, which in spite of, and even through, these divisions has advanced His cause in the world."

Before proceeding to discuss this third subject, we are constrained to point out that an all-important subject has been overlooked — intentionally. For all members of the conference knew that the subject in question insistently called for thorough discussion and an unequivocal declaration. It is the subject of the inspiration of Scripture. The preamble states that the object of the conference is to register the apparent fundamental agreements and the grave points of disagreements within the conference. All know that a bitter controversy has been waged these many years on the question of verbal inspiration. The conference did not choose to register this fundamental disagreement. The one declaration on this point to be found in the record is contained in this section: "The possession and acknowledgment of the Word of God as given in the Holy Scripture." The conference here took a straddling position, evading entirely the question of inspiration and leaving the question open whether the Word of God and Holy Scripture must be identified. The World Conference Lutherans failed in their duty toward God and the Church in that they did

not demand that this fundamental disagreement on inspiration be registered and, further, that agreement on verbal inspiration be set down as a *conditio sine qua non* of any proposed union. The Lutheran Confessions teach the verbal inspiration and identify Scripture and the Word of God. Professor Elert does not. In his conference address he declared for the modern-Lutheran view: "We believe with all Christians that the Holy Scriptures hold divine authority for us as the true record and testimony of the historical revelation of God." He is not in a position to perform the duty laid upon him by the Lutheran confessions. Others should have performed the duty and demanded that the conference disavow the modern Protestant and modern Lutheran teaching.

This missing section should also have contained an article on the source and norm of doctrine. The *Church Herald* states that "there seemed to be a general consent to the Bible as authority," and the *Lutheran*, that the conference was agreed "that Holy Scripture is the sole ultimate authority for the doctrines and practises of the Christian religion." Unfortunately the record does not show that. Was it not considered of sufficient importance? Or was it omitted because a general agreement was taken for granted? Then too much was taken for granted. The *Herald* declares: "We know that the attitude of many to the Bible as a clear, perfect, and sufficient guide is not subscribed to." Dr. Cadman does not subscribe to it and plainly told the conference so. His address to the conference contains these statements: "In brief, Christian theology was treated as a vital science in which no article was so perfect in its primary stages that it required nothing in addition. The apostles and their successors received from our Lord the seed of faith and the nucleus of a coherent system of belief; a vital seed, a vital nucleus, to be developed according to their potentialities under the Holy Spirit's illumination." And what does the phrase in the preamble mean: "strenuous endeavor to reach the truth as it is in God's mind"?

We have not the space for an exhaustive treatise of Subject No. 3 or of the others. But to touch upon a few points: The Biblical doctrine of the means of grace is not brought out. We have, indeed, the statement: "sanctifying them through the means of grace." A Lutheran would have added and put into the first place: "justifying." A Lutheran would not subscribe to the statement as it stands: "The Church is God's chosen instrument by which Christ reconciles men to God." Every Lutheran will subscribe to the statement: "God has given us the Gospel for the

salvation of the world." But so will every Catholic and every Unitarian. So it means nothing. Dr. Sherer, in his conference address, stressed the importance of the doctrine of the means of grace: "With the Lutherans the thing of chief importance is that the Word and the Sacraments, which are the divinely appointed means of grace, shall continue with the Church in their purity." And the *Lutheran*, in the issue which published this address (August 11), declares: "Right here is the sharp line of demarcation between Lutheranism and the Reformed type of Protestantism." That is generally admitted. Dr. Edmund D. Soper, dean of Duke University, reporting on the conference, writes in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, as quoted by the *Christian Century*: "The question is, How can this presence [of Jesus Christ in the Church] be assured? And here is where the divergence is sorely apparent to-day." Section III has failed to bring out the fundamental divergence.

"Christ reconciles men to God through faith, bringing their wills into subjection to His sovereignty," etc. That is not the Lutheran definition of faith. It is the definition given by the Ritschlians: "If he has in consequence attained to the religious standpoint of faith or to the attitude of entire surrender to the spiritual power there revealed [in the Bible]," etc. (W. Herrmann, *Sys. Theol.*, p. 60.)

"Note a): Some hold that this interpretation is given through the tradition of the Church; others, through the immediate witness of the Spirit to the heart and conscience of the believers; others, through both combined." But there are still "others." And they hold that the Holy Spirit speaks through Scripture itself, and through Scripture alone.

"Note c). One view is that no division of Christendom has ever come to pass without sin." So the Reformation was a sinful adventure. "Another view is that the divisions were the inevitable outcome of different gifts of the Spirit and different understandings of the truth." Accordingly, a peculiar gift of the Spirit is responsible for the attitude, *e. g.*, of the Roman Catholic Church towards the Reformation, and the Canons and Decrees of Trent express the truth as well as the Augsburg Confession. The third view also calls for penitence for the sinful Reformation. The Lutheran members of this section did not insist on, or did not succeed in, having a fourth, the Lutheran, view brought out in the report. Were they in accord with the sentiment uttered by Bishop Brent in the opening address, as reported in the *Federal*

Council Bulletin: "If unity has slipped away from our grasp, it is the common fault of the Christian world. . . . Every section has shared in shattering unity"? Were they not in accord with Dr. Sherer's conference address? It stated: "The reformers gathered at Augsburg were not unaware that a deplorable schism was taking place; but to them there was something to be dreaded far more than schism; that was that they should lose the light of the Gospel. . . . Where they put the blame for the schism is expressed in the following words: 'Those who in the beginning condemned manifest truth and are now persecuting it with the greatest cruelty will give an account for the schism that has been occasioned.'"

The plenary meeting of the Lutheran delegation did well in refusing to have the conference vote on the articles of this section as well as of the others; not so well in offering them to the churches as fit material for further discussion. E.

(To be concluded.)

Why Was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing Before the Diet?

W. H. T. DAU, Valparaiso, Ind.

3. Conference with Luther at the Hostel of the Teutonic Knights.

Luther would have preferred to return to Wittenberg after his speech to the Diet. To him the plan of continuing the deliberation on his teaching was hopeless. But it showed that there was still a powerful party in the Diet that wanted to make use of Luther for its antipapal measures. For a time Aleander had filled the princes with dread by depicting to them consequences that would follow if they were to foster Luther's "revolutionary"⁴²⁾ teaching; but this dread seems to have vanished while they were working on their statement of the *Grievances of the German Nation* against Rome and its misrule and malpractices. Their minds had become heated as they were gathering the evidence for their indictment of the Curia, and they were cherishing a wish to enter into an alliance with the Friar of Wittenberg, if only the latter could be induced to recede from his opposition to the decrees of the Council of Constance. Aleander was already trembling in anticipation of a possible recantation by Luther of his "worst

42) See DTC, 209.

heresies" and of his becoming the champion of the princes in their fight against Rome rule. But again Aleander had indulged in needless excitement — Luther recanted nothing. Luther was no opportunist; his vision was profounder and more far-reaching than that of the great politicians who tried to induce him for reasons of expediency to recant his "impractical" attacks upon the sacrosanct decrees of councils. The fundamental error of the German princes was their belief that dogma and discipline can be kept apart. Luther was convinced that the two cohere as closely as the evil root coheres with the impalatable fruit of a noxious tree. From the Pelagian doctrine of justification there resulted the lying indulgences; from the false conception of the Church there followed the arbitrary rule of the hierarchy; from the doctrine regarding purgatory there sprang the exploitation of the living. Luther saw that once he conceded the dogma, he could no longer assail the practise of the Roman leaders. Accordingly, the distinction, or separation, which the German princes wished him to make was for Luther an impossible one, and hence the conferences of the Diet's commission with Luther, which Aleander viewed with such fear, were futile from the start.

In the early morning hours on Wednesday, April 24,⁴³⁾ the herald, Caspar Storm, and a chaplain of the Archbishop of Treves came to conduct Luther to the hostel of the Teutonic Knights, where the archbishop had set up his residence. Cordatus reports that Luther's walk to the archbishop's residence nearly caused a riot. "Some fellows rushed up to them and cried, 'What? Have you taken him prisoner?'" Huss's fate at Constance was well remembered at Worms.

It was an illustrious gathering into which Luther stepped. Two electors, two bishops, two princes, and two representatives of cities had been chosen for the commission.⁴⁴⁾ The Electoral College was represented by Greiffenklau and by the learned and eloquent Joachim Nestor of Brandenburg, who was a perfect master of the Latin language. The bishops present were those of Brandenburg and Augsburg; the princes were Duke George of Saxony and the Master of the Teutonic Order, in whose hostel the meeting took place. The city representatives were Peutinger, of Augsburg, and Bock, of Strassburg. Luther came attended by Schurf, Amsdorf, and Justus Jonas.⁴⁵⁾ The opponents of Luther constituted

43) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, fol. 37 D.

44) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, 37.

45) RA, 560.

the majority of the commission, and Aleander testifies that the conduct of the princes was excellent. He was displeased, however, because the princes had excluded from this meeting the official of Treves, Eck, whom Aleander had bribed, and who "had conducted himself so excellently" at the examination of Luther in the Diet. Instead of this questionable character the examination of Luther had this time been entrusted to a pupil of Jacob Wimpheling and Ulrich Zasius, Dr. Jerome Veuss⁴⁶⁾ by name, who was then the chancellor of Margrave Philip of Baden. Veuss was a stanch Catholic; his daughter was the abbess at the convent of Lichtenthal.⁴⁷⁾ Even Aleander had to acknowledge that Veuss conducted the hearing of Luther in a skilful manner and as a loyal Roman Christian. And Luther himself admits in his letter to the Count of Mansfeld that the chancellor of Baden had addressed to him "a skilful, well-formed admonition" and had shown himself far superior to the official from Treves.⁴⁸⁾ Veuss himself reports⁴⁹⁾ that the day before, at six o'clock in the morning, he had been commissioned with the conduct of the conference at a preparatory consultation which the princes who belonged to the Commission held at the *Buergerhof* (City Hall). The "Doctor Badensis" would have preferred to be relieved of this task out of regard for his feeble health.⁵⁰⁾ Moreover, he says himself that he had been trained to solve knotty points in jurisprudence, but not in theology. However, having accepted the commission, he prepared for it well and opened the conference with an address that made a deep impression on all present.

In the first place, he explained to Luther that he had not at all been summoned for a disputation on the Creed, but that the princes, "being moved by a particular graciousness and sympathy and wishing to show him brotherly love," aimed at inducing him to make peace with the Church.⁵¹⁾ Veuss appealed to the testimony of the Church and to Luther's conscience. As regards the former, he pointed out to Luther what offense had been caused by his claim that councils had contradicted each other. They had, Veuss said,

46) Jerome Vehus, born 1483, studied at Pforzheim, matriculated at Freiburg 1503, professor of law 1510, after 1514 chancellor. "He was an Erasmian, opposed to the Reformation." Smith, E. B., III, 134 f.

47) Vierodt, *Gesch. d. evang. Kirche Badens*, 1, 132.

48) EE, 53, 72.

49) Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 21, 84. Comp. also Cordatus, No. 1724; Bindseil, I, 440; Foerstemann, 4, 350; RA, 611.

50) RA, 623.

51) Veuss, *l.c.*, p. 86.

taught, not *contraria*, but *diversa*, not contrary, but diverse doctrines.⁵²⁾ One could observe similar differences in the Gospel narratives; *e. g.*, when Zacchaeus, the publican, asks Christ to come into his house, while the centurion of Capernaum, from modesty, deprecates Christ's entering his home. Such contradictions must be adjusted from the attending circumstances and the special object to be attained in each instance. "On occasion and in an emergency" a council might even formulate decrees that seem to contradict Scripture, even as a diet may pass exceptional laws in contradiction to the common law. Such occurrences must be interpreted from the state of the times and the attending circumstances, and it would be wrong on that account to deny the authority of the council itself. Furthermore, Veuss declared that Luther's attacks on papal ordinances were offensive. Human ordinances were needed, he said, for the suppression of vice and the curbing of wantonness. In view of the constantly changing needs of the time the Church could not do without human ordinances. St. Martin, St. Nicholas, and many other saints had also attended councils; therefore it was wrong for Luther to pass such a harsh judgment on councils.

In the second place, Veuss stated that he could not spare Luther the charge that his books endangered the public peace, and he appealed to Luther's conscience to say whether the charge was not true. Referring to the Acts of the Apostles, Veuss remarked that the believers in those days had been of one heart and of one mind. Hence, if Luther meant to live and teach in an apostolic manner, he must labor for a similar concord. If he would recant his heretical writings, he would save those of his books which even his adversaries acknowledged to be good books. If he refused to do this, the Emperor would outlaw him and expel him from the Empire. It appears that the Badensian chancellor as well as the Friar of Wittenberg had peeped into the devil's cards; accordingly, Veuss warned Luther of the devil's scheme to render his salutary writings ineffectual by the latest heretical writings for which the devil had furnished him the inspiration.⁵³⁾ He warned Luther against "the terror by night, the arrow that flieth by day, the pestilence that walketh in darkness."⁵⁴⁾ The Saxon report of

52) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, 38.

53) Thus reads the Saxon account. In his own account, published later, Veuss states that his admonition was administered to Luther at the second conference. RA, 621.

54) Ps. 91, 5. 6.

Spalatin sums up Veuss's speech thus: "The whole address, built up in accordance with the rules of rhetoric and oratory, had for its aim to admonish Luther, on the one hand, that he would have a regard for law, right, and order, and on the other hand, that he would consider the danger of men's consciences becoming confused and the public interest." Veuss concluded his address with an ominous reminder of the penalties which the Emperor would impose.

In his reply Luther humbly and gratefully acknowledged the gracious intentions of his lordly collocutors towards such an insignificant little man as himself. He denied that he had lowered men's esteem of all councils. His only objection had been to the Council of Constance for having condemned the thesis of John Huss that the true Church is the sum total of those predestinated unto eternal life. By rejecting this thesis, Luther held, the council had placed itself in opposition to Scripture and to the statement in the Creed: "I believe a holy Christian Church."⁵⁵) Regarding obedience to be rendered the magistrates, Luther stated that he well knew that such obedience was a duty of Christians and that the individual citizen, for the sake of peace, must submit to the powers that be. But he asserted that neither of these considerations must be carried to such an extreme that one becomes a traitor to God's Word. When Luther had finished his statement, he was asked to withdraw, and the princes consulted with each other as to the further mode of procedure.

When Luther was again called into the conference, the Doctor Badensis proposed to Luther that he commit his writings to the Emperor and the Diet for their judgment, with the understanding that he would recant such writings as these two authorities would declare heretical. To this proposal Doctor Martinus replied, humbly and becomingly, that he would accept as judges, not only such great majesties and lords, but even the most lowly persons, if they would refute him with Scripture proofs. However, as to the teaching of Scripture that had a bearing on his cause, he was so clear in his own mind that he could not yield; for St. Augustine wrote that he had learned to respect only those writings which are called canonical and to accord faith to the rest of the teachers only as far as they had written truth.⁵⁶) His conscience, then, being bound and taken captive by God's Word, he begged not to urge him

55) RA, 562. — Letter to Count Albrecht of Mansfeld. EE, 53, 72 f.

56) Augustine, *Ep.*, 82. Migne, *Op. Aug.*, II, 277.

to deny his conviction. Hereupon Elector Joachim summed up the result of the conference by saying that Luther had declared that he would yield only when overcome with Holy Writ. Luther affirmed his statement, saying: "Yes, my dear lord; or with plain and manifest arguments and reasons." The conference was now adjourned, and the princes started for the *Buergerhof*. Only Greiffenklau remained with Luther, whom he treated kindly as his guest.

Veuss, who had followed the princes who were riding to the *Buergerhof*, met Doctor Peutinger in the market-place, and the latter told Veuss in passing that he had just learned from Schurf that Luther was ready to submit his cause to the judgment of the Estates at the Diet. Peutinger asked Veuss to convey this information to his margrave and to announce it at the conference of the princes. He said that he had already communicated this news to the Bishop of Brandenburg. Accordingly, Veuss, taking up a position at the stairway of the *Buergerhof*, began to talk of the prospect of reaching an understanding with Luther in a more optimistic strain than he would have done otherwise. For this reason Veuss was charged afterwards with having circulated an inaccurate report, and this forced him in June, after he had returned to Baden, to address a letter to his prince, the Margrave of Baden, in which he defends himself against the charge and, besides, raises a protest against other points in the Saxon publication *Acta Lutheri Wormatiæ*.⁵⁷⁾

4. Luther the Guest of Greiffenklau.

By an order of Greiffenklau, the Archbishop of Treves, Luther was detained at the hostel of the Teutonic Knights after the conference had been adjourned. The archbishop sent for Luther to join him in the dining-hall on the second floor. There Luther found the official, Eck, who had conducted his hearing at the Diet and the *Dechant* of Frankfort, Cochlaeus.⁵⁸⁾ All sat down to a luncheon. Since this is the only time that Luther lunched with the archbishop, the anecdote which Luther's physician, Ratzeberger, has told must be referred to this occasion. Ratzeberger relates that as Luther was about to raise his glass to his lips and, according to his habit, made the sign of the cross over the glass, the bottom fell out. Luther's friends suspected that an attempt to poison him

57) Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 21, 83 ff. Comp. also Wrede, RA, 611.

58) Spalatin, *Annals*, 44; Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, fol. 39.

had been made and was thus frustrated. Luther himself entertained no such suspicion; his explanation was that the glass had been dashed into cold water, which had caused a fissure that was not discovered when the wine was poured in.⁵⁹⁾ Still Luther did not feel quite at ease at this luncheon. Aleander remarks sneeringly that Luther asked to have his guardians Schurf and Amsdorf present. Luther's experience with a man like Eck, who had already become known as a hired tool of Aleander,⁶⁰⁾ and with the other expert Romanist, Cochlaeus, "the wrathful mannikin with the bell cap," had not been of a nature to inspire confidence. Cochlaeus, who was cathedral *Dechant* at the *Liebfrauenkirche* at Frankfurt, had as late as the preceding year followed his humanistic bent and had publicly taken Luther's side; but after the publication of Luther's *Babylonian Captivity* he had changed his mind, and this tergiversation had not raised him in the public esteem. When he started upon his own initiative⁶¹⁾ for the Diet on April 16, accompanied only by his young nephew, his colleagues at Frankfurt looked after him with an ironical expression, and one of them, Canon Wolfgang Koenigstein, expressed great surprise over the fact that their *Dechant* seemed to be the only theologian whom Greiffenklau thought a match for the Friar of Wittenberg.⁶²⁾ "He had nobody present," Koenigstein muses, "except our *Dechant*, John Cochlaeus, who on Tuesday after Misericordias Domini, which was April 16, went out to Worms to meet Luther. The astonishing things he did I shall pass over; for it is being said that he met with many a setback there and elsewhere." In Worms, Cochlaeus called on "the fox" Capito, who also on this occasion was carrying water on both shoulders and introduced the *Dechant* of Frankfurt to Aleander.⁶³⁾

Cochlaeus did not have to wait long for employment. To begin with, the nuncio had him make excerpts from Luther's writings, thus increasing *post festum* his stock of knowledge of Luther. The manuscripts of Cochlaeus are still in the archives of the Vatican. They are Latin excerpts from Luther's *Instruction for Those Going to Confession*, from the *Tessaradekas*, the *Address to the German Nobility*, and the *New Karsthans*.⁶⁴⁾

59) Ratzeberger, edited by Neudecker, p. 51 f.

60) Aleander, April 27. Balan, 74, p. 195.

61) *Privatim et ultro a nomine vocatus*. *Comm.*, p. 39.

62) See G. Ed. Steitz, l. c. (*Die Melanchthon- u. Lutherherbergen; Neujahrsschrift d. Vereins f. Gesch. zu Frankfurt a. M.*, 1861), p. 11.

63) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, 39.

64) Against Murnar, RA, 624.

On April 24, Aleander, of whom even the Emperor said he knew that he never slept, sent for the Frankfurt *Dechant* at four o'clock in the morning⁶⁵⁾ and ordered him to be at the lodging of the archbishop in order to take part in the conference with Luther. But Aleander instructed Cochlaeus under no condition to engage in a doctrinal discussion with Luther, but only to pay close attention and then to give Aleander a faithful account.⁶⁶⁾ However, Cochlaeus had not come to Worms to place his light under a bushel, and to his own hurt he disregarded Aleander's counsel.

The discussion seems to have been quite lively. Luther relates: "Now there were some present who wanted to instruct me how to frame my answer, but Thun [Schurf] told them: 'You need not teach him; he will know what to say.'"⁶⁷⁾ With the same brutality with which Eck had treated Luther at the public hearing before the Diet, he spoke in great style against Luther's Scripture principle. He said that there never had been a heresy but it originated in the Bible. The Arian error had sprung from the statement in John 14, 28: "The Father is greater than I." Another heresy had been caused by Matt. 1, 25: "Joseph did not know his wife until she had brought forth her first-born Son." Accordingly, Eck proposed to overthrow the thesis that the true Church is the communion of saints. Dr. Martin and Schurf, however, reproved him sharply. Meanwhile the archbishop was called outside, since Veuss had arrived with a message.⁶⁸⁾

The ensuing intermission was employed by Cochlaeus in introducing himself to the other gentlemen present and requesting their aid for inducing Luther to terminate his controversy. Cochlaeus himself warned Luther that, if he proceeded in his present course, he would ruin the highly gifted Philip Melanchthon and other young men for the Church. "Well," said Luther, "what am I to do then?" Cochlaeus advised him to go before any judge and submit to his verdict.

When the archbishop returned, the discussion was taken up again, and particular theses in Luther's writings were more thoroughly discussed.⁶⁹⁾ "Now the Archbishop of Treves, who

65) See his *Colloquium cum Luthero*. RA, 624. In 1540 Cochlaeus claimed to have been summoned by the Archbishop of Treves, perhaps upon a request from Aleander.

66) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, fol. 39.

67) EE, 64, 371.

68) RA, 625.

69) See passages in Illgen's *Zeitschr.*, etc., 21, 92 f.

was, verily, quite a versatile man of the world, with gracious words led the discussion to a point where he would have persuaded and induced Dr. M. Luther to yield a little.⁷⁰⁾ The conversation turned about the question whether a single individual had the right to rise in opposition to official decrees of councils. Luther was urging the Pauline thesis: "If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace."⁷¹⁾ At this point Cochlaeus broke into the conversation with the sneering question whether *Luther* had perhaps received a revelation. Aleander, upon information of Cochlaeus, reported to Rome that Luther had at first claimed to have received a revelation, but the next moment had denied it.⁷²⁾ Moreover, Cochlaeus had boasted to Aleander that his and Eck's arguments had completely cowed Luther. However, Luther claims that when the archbishop gave Cochlaeus the floor, the latter had thumped the table with his finger and said nothing else than: "O Martin, Martin, you are speaking *per talenta!*"⁷³⁾ To the Count of Mansfeld Luther wrote: "It was a wordless disputation; they tried to get at me with sharp words, but did not hit the mark." The Saxon report of Spalatin complains⁷⁴⁾ that during the conversation "the official of Treves and Dr. Cochlaeus had sometimes spoken at the same time and had not given Luther sufficient time to answer them." Cochlaeus complains that Schurf had hurled the words at him, "Let him speak, why don't you?"

Finally, Eck attacked Luther for taking the part of Huss, and the discussion of the thesis that the Church is the sum total of the elect turned into a regular scholastic controversy between Eck and Luther. Cochlaeus found it necessary to remark that Luther wanted to cite passages of Scripture, but did not remember the exact words, while from Schurf, who always spoke German when he interrupted the discussion, he claims to have heard a Latin word.⁷⁵⁾

At length, the dinner hour having arrived, the archbishop terminated the conversation. While Luther was departing, Cochlaeus exhorted him to recant the doctrines which were displeasing to all decent people. Luther replied that he had not attacked any one personally. Cochlaeus queried, "Not even Leo X?" Luther

70) Spalatin, *Annals*, 44.

71) 1 Cor. 14, 30.

72) Report of April 27. Balan, 74. Comp. *Colloquium Cochlaeicum Lutheri Wormatiae habitum*. Moguntiae, 1540. RA, 626, and Luther's account to the Count of Mansfeld of May 3. XV, 1912 ff.

73) EE, 31, 302.

74) RA, 607.

75) RA, 627.

replied, "He is not a private, but a public person." And so they parted. Luther left in an elated state of mind, conscious of victory, and this fact chagrined the *Dechant* very much. According to the report of the nuncio the archbishop betook himself forthwith to the meeting of the princes, where he obtained from the Emperor a grudging consent to continue the conferences with Luther, which to Greiffenklau still seemed to open up a hopeful prospect.⁷⁶⁾

5. Cochlaeus Visits Luther.

Bashfulness was not a weakness of Cochlaeus. On the afternoon of Wednesday, April 24, he appeared at the hostel of the Knights of St. John on pretense of making a visit to Spalatin. He was met by Amsdorf, who conducted him up-stairs, where Cochlaeus found Luther in company with Petzensteiner, Suaven, Schurf, Jonas, and Thilmann Conradi.⁷⁷⁾ Schurf and Amsdorf took a seat near Cochlaeus, who begged them to counsel Luther more emphatically to make peace with the Church.⁷⁸⁾ Petzensteiner was itching for a dogmatic tilt, and the company was first amazed and then hugely amused to hear him challenge the Frankfurt *Dechant* to a debate. Cochlaeus replied angrily: "Little brother, do you think that there are men only at Wittenberg? What did you do recently? What had the Dominican prior done to you whose gown you plucked in public as he was descending from the pulpit, and whom you charged with having badly interpreted Paul in his sermon? Might you not by such an act endanger Luther's safe-conduct? For the safe-conduct was not issued as a license for insulting people." Luther stepped up to the group, laughing, and said, in a bantering tone: "My brother may be more learned than all of us, especially when he has drunk his fill." All were laughing; only Petzensteiner looked indignant, especially since Cochlaeus had addressed him "little brother."

Cochlaeus now took a seat with Luther and admonished him not to drag all the excellent men present into perdition with him. However, these excellent men, especially Justus Jonas, told him that they took an entirely different view of the situation. One of them upbraided the former Humanist that he had turned traitor to the liberal arts and had attacked Luther in an oration. Cochlaeus expostulated with them, saying that the oration had been spread among the people against his will, most likely by the Humanist Nesen. He declared that he was pained at Luther's

76) BAL, p. 163.

77) Comp. DTC, p. 170.

78) RA, 627 f.

stubbornness. One of the noblemen remarked, "But Luther is not pained." "He soon will be," warningly said the *Dechant*. Schurf now repeated Petzensteiner's challenge and called upon Cochlaeus to name a single teaching in which Luther was in error. Cochlaeus had no desire to enter into a debate with this company of Lutherans. He merely asked why Luther was disturbing the people with his utraquism,⁷⁹⁾ when he had to admit that the body of Christ was received also when the Sacrament is administered only in one form. The gentlemen present appealed to the fact that the cup had been ordained for general use in the Biblical account of the Sacrament. Cochlaeus, however, argued that the term "cup" stands for the contents of the cup, and these the communicant receives also in the bread. Thus the argument drifted to transubstantiation and the Mass. The room was filled with Lutherans, and the *Dechant* could not quit the argument without damaging his theological reputation and exposing himself to ridicule. Accordingly, he appealed to the Fourth Lateran Council, alleging that it had sanctioned transubstantiation. Luther replied: "The Word of God is superior to councils." Cochlaeus claimed that even Ambrose had taught a *conversio* (transformation) in the Lord's Supper. Luther denied this and said that Ambrose had only spoken of a *mutatio* (change). Luther proceeded to exhibit the ludicrous side of transubstantiation, when Cochlaeus proposed to him that he should forfeit his safe-conduct and hold a public disputation with him. This proposal roused a storm of indignation among the knights. "Why must Luther surrender his safe-conduct?" they cried. Cochlaeus remarked that the Lutherans themselves had boasted that Luther would even forfeit his safe-conduct if his opponents would consent to meet him in a public disputation. Schurf exclaimed, "Who should be as foolish as that?"⁸⁰⁾ The Saxon noblemen were so angered by the audacious suggestion of Cochlaeus that they were inclined to throw the *Dechant* down the stairs. Volrat of Watzdorf was about to "facilitate Cochlaeus's exit with a bloody head if he had not been checked."⁸¹⁾ Luther took a humorous view of Cochlaeus's proposal. "He suggested that I renounce my safe-conduct, and he would hold a disputation

79) The Biblical teaching regarding the Lord's Supper, which holds that both forms of the Sacrament, the bread and the wine, must be administered.

80) *Table Talk*, Foerstemann, 4, 351.

81) EE, 64, 373. "Haette ihm beinahe einen ziemlichen Kochloeffel gereicht." Krumhaar, *Mansfeld*, N. 9; cf. EB, 2, 145.

with me. One could have split laughing at the booby; so sillily he talked." ⁸²⁾ When Cochlaeus inquired whom Luther would choose as umpire for their disputation, Luther replied, "A boy eight years old"; and when the question was repeated more urgently, Luther raised the umpire's age to nine years.

Meanwhile several persons of noble rank had entered the room. Cochlaeus took one of them for the Saxon Elector, but it was the Count of Mansfeld. The nobleman asked that the argument between Luther and Cochlaeus be continued. Accordingly, surrounded by a congested circle of guests, the disputants continued their argument on the formula of distribution in the Lord's Supper, "This is My body." Luther interpreted the formula after the analogy of the thesis: God is man. Cochlaeus still insisted that Luther appoint a judge for a disputation, and Luther pointed to the youngest layman present, most likely the nephew whom Cochlaeus had taken with him from Frankfurt. Cochlaeus replied indignantly, "I will not have him." The Count of Mansfeld now suggested that the confused talk in the overcrowded room be terminated, and the two opponents entered Luther's bed-room to come to an agreement there. Spite of Cochlaeus's protestation that he had not come armed, Luther insisted on the presence of witnesses during their face-to-face conversation. The weapons which Luther feared were other than knives and daggers. Accordingly, Cochlaeus took his nephew and Luther his Petzensteiner with him into the bed-room. Both took seats at some distance from the young men, and Luther began to talk kindly about the preceding discussion. He admitted that he had made rather violent attacks upon the Roman See, but he expressed satisfaction over having crushed the soul-destroying indulgences. Cochlaeus now reiterated all the proposals which others before him had made to Luther: he was to offer a partial recantation, to consent to a court of arbitration, etc. He declared that the Archbishop of Treves stood ready to assign Luther to a post where he could live in peace. Cochlaeus appealed to Luther's conscience not to hurl such a genius as Philip Melanchthon with him into perdition. He worked himself into such agitation that he shed tears, and he boasted afterwards that he had moved also Luther to tears. Luther admitted that Melanchthon was much more learned than himself. "What cruelty," Cochlaeus exclaimed, "to place such a man in danger too!" Finally Luther said: "My dear Doctor, I understand quite well that you are dealing with me

82) EE, 31, 302; Cordatus, 1721.

from an evil purpose. But I am the least factor in this business; there are others, greater and more learned than myself. I preach and deliver public lectures on the Psalms. What I am doing is a mere trifle. Hence, it would be useless for me to recant ever so long and ever so often; for others far more learned than I would not remain silent and would continue the controversy." Tearfully Cochlaeus now extended his hand to Luther to say good-by; but he assured Luther at the same time that he would write against him. Luther replied that he would not fail to answer.

The next morning Cochlaeus met Justus Jonas with two other friends of Luther at the Dominican monastery. He had heard from Capito that the Lutherans were incensed because of his proposal that Luther surrender his safe-conduct. Jonas, too, expressed his surprise to Cochlaeus that he alone, from among a thousand Humanists, had sided with the barbarians. "Do with me whatever you please," Cochlaeus replied; "I can never be a Hussite." Jonas, however, advised him not to write against Luther, or forty learned men would take up their pens to write against Cochlaeus.

To Aleander, Cochlaeus reported marvelous facts by which he had triumphed over Luther, and the nuncio made honorable mention of Cochlaeus in his report to Rome and obtained for him a reward of ten gulden. The reward was so niggard that Saraccioli added one or two dispensations to make it look more valuable.⁸³) The dispensations cost nothing and were worth nothing.

Aleander found to his delight that Cochlaeus confirmed an opinion which the nuncio had long fostered, *viz.*, that "the monster" (Luther) was neither a grammarian nor a philosopher nor a theologian, but a "sheer maniac." "There is a universal conviction," Aleander writes to Medici, after receiving Cochlaeus's report, "that Luther has not composed the greater part of the writings in question himself, and he has even confidentially communicated to some that the more vicious of his books are by his friends, to whom he has pledged his word not to reveal them. Hence he speaks of this matter only to one or the other when no witnesses are present. Moreover, he has said to Cochlaeus that for his part he, as a rule, preaches and teaches and comments on the Psalms, and that those books about which such a hubbub has occurred have been composed by his friends, and that, if he were to recant, more than twenty others would arise and would make matters worse from day to day. In short, in dealing with him, nothing was gained, neither with

83) BAL, p. 175.

instruction nor admonition nor cunning, for he stubbornly stuck to his one statement that he would not act contrary to his conscience." This shows that Cochlaeus had been so prudent as to report to Aleander precisely such things as Aleander wished him to report; for that Luther had really renounced the authorship of his writings it is impossible to conceive, unless Cochlaeus had fathered upon Luther all books that had been written in opposition to Rome, which Luther could justly deny. *(To be concluded.)*

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Pretheological and Theological Training.—A question that is confronting us with increasing emphasis is this: Shall the emphasis be placed upon general training or upon specific preparation? Some interesting material, which may well guide an intelligent discussion of the question, is found in an address delivered by Dr. Evjen upon the occasion of his formal induction into office as professor of Church History in the Divinity School of Wittenberg College, Springfield, O., a little more than two years ago. Some of the outstanding suggestions which we find in this pamphlet are the following: "A theological seminary may be a real graduate school of theology. Or it may be a roughly organized confusion of scholasticism and Sunday-school method. . . . We do not advocate any measure that will shorten the three-year course in theology by transferring, as is now and then suggested, one year of work to the college. The course is too short as it already is. We need lengthening, not shortening. . . . For years there has been a growing conviction that a missionary should get the best theological training possible, and that a seminary for missionaries alone cannot give the missionary the broad training which he can receive in a university proper." — By way of stimulating discussion, the author gives a summary of requirements in the universities and theological seminaries of the Continent. He shows that the German requirement is six years of Greek, nine years of Latin, a working knowledge of Hebrew, and the use of the mother tongue. In addition, the minimum requirement of the university in theological branches is about four years. In Bavaria five years are required to complete the graduate course for ministerial work, while Wuerttemberg requires from four to four and a half years. In Denmark the theological faculty requires thirteen semesters, or six and a half years of work in theoretic theology and philosophy. In Norway the man studying theology at the University of Oslo is expected to take a course of four to four and a half years, and the usual number of years which a student of theology requires for theological work is six years after college graduation. In Sweden the requirements are that a student devote from five and a half years to six years to theological study. Similar requirements obtain in Finland. And in every case it is to be remembered that those who

matriculate for the courses in theology in the university and the seminary have been graduated in a highly specialized classical course. In Finland the requirements for a man who is a candidate for ordination are the following. The entire Old Testament must have been studied in Hebrew, with Introduction, Biblical Theology, and Biblical Archeology; the entire New Testament studied in Greek, in detailed exegesis, and New Testament Theology. In Church History a general knowledge is required, especially of Finnish church history; the person to be examined must also have made a detailed study of portions of the writings of the Church Fathers and of a special work about Luther and the Reformation; he must write an independent thesis on a theme in church history. In Dogmatics and Ethics he must have read various newer Lutheran works and be acquainted with the Lutheran Confessions in the original. He must be at home in the various branches of practical theology and write a thesis on some subject in practical theology. He must also have passed the *Filosofie-Kandidat* examination, which corresponds to a year's training in philosophical branches after completing the *Gymnasium*. (A. Neovius, in Nielsen's *Kirche-Leksikon* I, 834.) — All of these statements certainly provide food for serious thought, especially in the face of the situation which seems to be confronting us at the present time.

K.

Threatening the American Home. — The *Watchman-Examiner* calls attention to the danger threatening the American home in the ever-increasing number of married women that seek employment. It says editorially: "At the present time there are supposed to be 2,000,000 married women in the professions, in business, and in various money-making occupations. Certain professional and business women count it beneath their dignity to spend their precious time in housekeeping, in attending to babies, and in other domestic affairs. These women have entered the professional and business world from choice; but there can be no doubt at all that a large majority of married women who are working outside their own homes are doing it from necessity. The standard and cost of living are higher than ever before. Much money is demanded for the up-keep of a respectable home. Husbands are sometimes ill, sometimes unfortunate, sometimes worthless. Whatever the reason may be, an increasing number of wives and mothers are out in the workaday world. It is conceivable that often the home is so cared for as not to miss the ministry of the wife or mother; but taking it all in all, do not the facts presented here predict ominous results to the American home of which we have been so proud and to which our nation has owed so much?"

There are still more serious problems than those here alluded to. What about the raising of children and their Christian training? The situation is certainly serious.

MUELLER.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

One of the great tasks of the Vatican is to see to it that its all-important rules of etiquette are not broken. Recently King Fuad of Egypt called on Pope Pius XI. Since the etiquette of the Vatican, as *America* reports, does not permit that any one should go directly from the Quirinal

Palace to call upon the Pope, King Fuad moved from the Royal Palace to the Excelsior Hotel. Papal officials then called for the king and escorted him to the Vatican. What momentous matters the Vatican is privileged to spend its time on!

Princeton Seminary has almost a record attendance this year, 250 students. In its long history of 110 years this mark has been surpassed but once.

Some of us will be surprised to learn that slavery still exists in British Africa. In Sierra Leone slavery is still recognized by law and runaway slaves may be recaptured. The understanding in England has been that this legal provision was a dead letter, but a recent decision of the high court in Sierra Leone upholds the old law.

Dr. Cadman recently said in reply to an inquiry that he did not believe the account of the Flood in the Book of Genesis. His reason is that there was not sufficient water available to cover the whole globe at one time, and that the addition of enough water would have seriously disturbed our planets' place in space. Professor Price ably answers him in the *Bible Champion*, pointing out that if all the land visible now above sea-level should sink into the water and be submerged, this would raise the water only about 650 feet, since there is so much more water than land on the surface of our globe.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer, known for his book *The Quest of the Historical Jesus (Darstellungen des Lebens Jesu)*, is engaged in mission-work in Africa, where he is at the head of a hospital. Just at present he is in Europe on a furlough. He is rightly called one of the most remarkable men of our age, being a musician, a physician, and a brilliant New Testament scholar. His theology, sad to say, is ultramodern.

A new book on Henry Ward Beecher having appeared, written by a Mr. Hibben, the press is again discussing the question whether this famous pulpit orator was guilty of the crime he was charged with, but acquitted of by his church and an ecclesiastical council, while in the civil court trial, which lasted 112 days, the jury could not agree, nine standing for acquittal and three for conviction. A lengthy review of the book has been published in the *Christian Century*. Mr. William E. Barton, the writer of the review, is willing to give Beecher the benefit of the doubt. He calls this rather vitriolic biography a second volume of *Elmer Gantry*.

A minister of the Reformed Church in Rochester told his hearers that the hand of God is visible in the drowning of aviators who flew toward America. He maintained that God is on the side of America, protecting it from foreign invasion by aeroplanes, and will continue to do it as long as it trusts in Him and obeys Him. What a caricature this is making of the teaching the Bible presents on God's guidance of affairs! It is simply claptrap of the cheapest kind.

A very interesting account of the Inner Mission Movement in Denmark has been written by Rev. Stinus S. Loft, Webster Groves, Mo. The people constituting this movement are contending for the authority of the Gospel and for salvation through the blood of Christ. The scope and the proportions of the work done are simply marvelous. What is weak about the movement is its connection with the state church. The above-mentioned account has appeared in pamphlet form and can be bought from the author (407 Fairview Ave., Webster Groves, Mo.).

Catholics are lecturing Protestants these days, using the Lausanne Conference as a text. *America*, a Catholic weekly, says: "The price of unity, then, is submission, not to man or to human creeds or to the conclusions of conferences and congresses, but to the authority of Christ's Church, as embodied in His visible representative on earth, the Bishop of Rome." Thank God that nobody need pay this price! It is true, there must be some authority, if there is to be unity, but "the Word is nigh thee." Rom. 10, 8. And the Savior says: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed."

BOOK REVIEW.

The Proof Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary.

By *Louis Wessel, D.D.* 155 pages, 6¼×9¼. \$3.50. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The readers of the *Theological Quarterly* and, later, of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY will remember that in 1898 the sainted Dr. A. L. Graebner began to print explanations of the proof-texts of the Catechism. This series was subsequently continued by Dr. W. H. T. Dau and later by Dr. Louis Wessel. The publication in the MONTHLY, however, was discontinued before the work was completed. Dr. Wessel then completed it, and the Concordia Supply Company of our Springfield Seminary published the complete edition in two volumes. Since this edition has been exhausted, our Publishing House has made a zincphotographic reproduction in one volume.

The truths of the Catechism ought to be taught on the basis of Scripture; hence, proof-texts. The Catechism should not be taught by demanding that the questions and answers given in the exposition be learned by heart and then the Bible-texts *added*, but the Bible-texts should first be studied and the truths derived from them. Sound, thorough exegesis, therefore, is needed for instruction in the catechismal truths as well as for the pastor's sermon work. This is reason sufficient why theological students and young pastors ought to welcome the reproduction of *Proof Texts of the Catechism*.
FRITZ.

The Wide-Open Island City. Home Mission Work in a Big City.

By *Carl A. Gieseler*. Vol. V of *Men and Missions*, edited by *L. Fuerbringer*. 59 pages. 25 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This fifth booklet in the *Men and Missions* series, by Carl A. Gieseler, is filled with human-interest stories gleaned from a pastor's experience in doing mission-work in a large city. It has the following chapter heads: Geographical, Beginnings, The Missionary, Getting to Work, Progress, The Helpmate, Enlarging the Tabernacle, Real Progress, The Language Question, "Missionieren," Canvassing, Difficulties, Various Experiences, Farewell. It is dedicated to our Lutheran youth.
FRITZ.

Synodical Proceedings: South Wisconsin District. 88 pages. 55 cts.

English District. 108 pages. 70 cts. *Eastern District.* 96 pages. 60 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The minutes of the South Wisconsin District contain a doctrinal paper on "The Fundamentals of the Christian Religion," by Pastor W. Lochner, and the outline of a historical paper, by Prof. O. F. Hattstaedt, on "The Work of Our Church in Southern Wisconsin." A doctrinal paper on "Authority in the Church," by Pastor Harry E. Olsen, is printed in the minutes of the English District, and in those of the Eastern District there is a continuation of a German essay on "The Deity of Christ," by Pastor Christian Kuehn, and an English essay on "The Proper Use of the Doctrine of the Church," by Pastor Geo. Luecke.
FRITZ.

Das christliche Gemeindeleben. 36 pages. 25 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This is an essay which was read at the recent convention of the Oklahoma District of our Synod by Pastor W. Mahler. It speaks of the Christian life, or the true spirituality, of a Christian congregation: how it is brought about; how it manifests itself; who its enemies are; what its goal should be.

FRITZ.

Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers mit in den Text eingeschalteter Auslegung, etc. Herausgegeben von *August Daechsel*. 4. Band: Die prophetischen Buecher. \$4.00. (A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This fourth volume of Daechsel's famous work, treating the major and minor prophets, Isaiah to Malachi, exhibits the same characteristics as the first and third volumes, which have been reviewed in these columns. The comments are clear, full, pertinent. That they are copious is apparent from the size of the volume, which is 954 pages. Details which deserve favorable mention are, for instance, the acceptance of the view taught by the Scriptures themselves that the whole Book of Isaiah comes from the hands of the prophet bearing that name and that hence chapters 40—66 are authentic; the position which is the only one consonant with the words of the Scriptures, that the prophecies in the Book of Daniel were written by that great man of God in the sixth century B. C. and are not to be regarded as a fabrication *ex eventu* in the second century B. C.; and again, the defense of the historical character of the Book of Jonah. The quotations from various writers, for example, from Matthias Claudius in the comments on the miracle by which Jonah's life was preserved, are often strikingly apt. The point of view throughout is that of the believing Bible Christian, who looks for safety in the work of the Redeemer. It is to be regretted that the author was an advocate of Chiliasm and that on this account there are sections where his interpretation cannot be adopted.

Christliche Wissenschaft (Christian Science) in Widerspruch mit Gottes Wort. Von *A. Burgdorf*. 30 Pf. (Verlag des Schriftenvereins [E. Klaerner], Zwickau.)

This is a good pamphlet, presenting a discussion and refutation of the dangerous errors taught by the propagandists of the sect falsely called Christian Science.

Manual for Concordia Edition Bobbs-Merrill Readers. Primer, 142 pages. 25 cts., net. First Reader, 84 pages. 25 cts., net. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

These *Manuals* will well serve those pastors and teachers who are using the Bobbs-Merrill series of readers, as these have been printed in a revised edition for our own Publishing House. We omit a detailed review; that belongs in a professional journal.

FRITZ.

Spiritismus im Lichte der Schrift. Von *Johannes Karstin*. 20 Pf.
(Verlag des Schriftenvereins [E. Klaerner], Zwickau.)

A brief, but virile tract, throwing the light of Holy Scripture on that growth of darkness, Spiritism.

Lutheran Annual. 1928. Price, 15 cts. Concordia Publishing House,
St. Louis, Mo.

**Amerikanischer Kalender fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr
1928.** Price, 15 cts. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

These two well-known publications of our Synod give the calendar for the new year, with the usual data, such as the Sundays of the church-year, the time when the sun rises and sets, and the moon phases. They also give Scripture readings for every day of the year. In addition, they contain some reading-matter and the very valuable list of pastors and teachers of the Synodical Conference. It goes without saying that one of these publications ought to be in the home of every one of our Lutheran people.

FRTZ.

Ev.-Luth. Hausfreund-Kalender fuer 1928. Herausgegeben von *Martin Willkomm*. 18 cts. (Verlag und Druck von Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

If you wish to provide yourself and your family with wholesome reading-matter in the German language, buy this almanac. Here you find bits of choice poetry and a good deal of interesting prose, wise sayings, and useful instruction, hints for the soul and for the mind, things entertaining and uplifting, a beautiful variety of edifying reading-matter. My congratulations to the editor and to those who choose to become his readers.

Glad Hosannas! By *Walter Wismar*. 72 pages, 6×9. 35 cts.; in dozen lots, 25 cts.; in hundred lots, 20 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Mr. Walter Wismar, the organist and choirmaster at Holy Cross Lutheran Church, St. Louis, and an instructor in the school of that church, has in this booklet given us a collection of sixty-three Christmas chorals and carols; five of the musical compositions in the collection are his own. In the preface Mr. Wismar says: "We sing in school and in church, but do we sing at home? Or if we do, are the songs worth while, or are they only songs of the hour? Do we sing and play sacred hymns? . . . Wherever there is a piano in a Christian home, there ought also to be found a hymnal or a choral book." As the pictures on the walls, so also the songs which are sung in a home are characteristic of that home.

FRTZ.

Of Judah's Tribe and David's House. — A Liturgical Service for Children and the Entire Congregation. **Aus Judas Stamm und Davids Haus.** Ein liturgischer Gottesdienst fuer Kinder und Gemeinde. — By *Prof. P. E. Kretzmann, D. D.*, and *Walter Wismar*. — Price, 5 cts.; per dozen, 50 cts.; per hundred, \$3.50. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a good Christmas Eve service, offering both German and English text.

Glory to the New-Born King! A Children's Christmas Service. By *Walter O. Kraeft*. 8 pages, 6×9. 6 cts.; dozen, 60 cts.; hundred, \$4.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

A good, brief Christmas program of catechization, hymns, and, if desired, recitations. Its simplicity recommends it. FRITZ.

Exclusive Christmas Greeting Cards. No. 1927. Religious Texts — Christian Sentiments — Original Designs. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

We are pleased to announce the publication of these Christmas cards, the intention of which is "to help put Christ back into Christmas greetings." They are well gotten up in seven colors of ten different designs, each carrying a rhymed greeting and Scripture-text. They are sold only according to the following plan: Our Publishing House sells them to parochial and Sunday-schools put up in boxes containing twenty-five packages; each package contains ten different cards. The school pays fifteen cents a package, and sells them at twenty-five cents, the profit being used as the school decides. Our people, we believe, will be glad to buy these cards, if offered to them. FRITZ.

The firm of Ernst Kaufmann, New York and Chicago, has sent us the following items: —

Day by Day with Jesus, Calendar for 1928. The joint work of over 100 of our ministers from all parts of the country; edited by *W. H. T. Dau*, president of Valparaiso University. 60 cts.

Crown Him Lord of All. Stories of the world's great, whose delight was in the service of the Lord Jesus. By *Prof. Th. Graebner*. 30 cts.

Bringing Christ to the Ojibways in Michigan. Christmas in the Black Belt. By *Prof. W. G. Polack*. A new series of Missionary Hero Stories from mission-fields at home and abroad. 30 cts. each.

Under the Christmas-Tree. By *Uncle Timothy* (Prof. Th. Graebner). Another of the famous Golden Hour Series of Bible stories, narratives, and poetry for children eight to ten, gathered by Uncle Timothy. 30 cts.

In His Keeping. By *Prof. Th. Graebner*. Stories for boys and girls of lively action, each illustrating a clean Christian moral. 30 cts.

Guests of Holy Night. By *Prof. Th. Graebner*. Stories for Christian Folks. 50 cts.

We heartily recommend the above items to our readers. They may order them from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.



Index.

- Ambassador at Heathen Shrine, p. 150.
- Amendment, the Eighteenth, 252.
- Anniversary of A. H. Francke, 267.
- Archeology against Evolution, 25; Proofs of Antediluvian Civilization, 84; Commentary on Is. 3, 177.
- Ark of Covenant, Search for the, 83.
- Art of Saying Nothing, 251.
- Atheists; Will their Wrath in the End Praise God? 250.
- Augustana Synod, 81.
- Bell on Trial, 22.
- Ben Hur*, 50.
- Bible; Is the Bible the Word of God? 271; Proof that It Is God's Word, 174; Bible as Literature, 49; Authorized Version Defended, 337; Remarks on Some New Testament Manuscripts, 238; Bible Not Out of Date, 180; Wanted: An Expurgated Bible, 181; Who has been Romancing? 216; Bible Sunday, 23.
- Boehmer, Dr. H., Deceased, 206.
- Buddhist Sunday-school Movement, 180.
- Burrell, Dr. David James, 47.
- Child-labor Legislation, 53.
- Christ, Virgin Birth of, 133. 161. 193; Does Paul Call Jesus God? 97; Why Jesus is Not Popular To-day, 149.
- Christmas Atmosphere in Song, 49.
- Church and Spirit of the Age, 177. Is the Church Decadent? 82; Poor Diagnosticians — Poor Physicians, 208; Is the Visible Church Losing Her Spirituality? 19; Is the Community Church a Solution? 20; Church History According to Rome, 342.
- Collection, a Very Successful, 269.
- Commentaries Failed, 148.
- Community Church a Solution? 20.
- Conferences, Private, with the Pastor, 118.
- Confession, Private, 118.
- Conscience, 33.
- Constitution; Is the Decalog Part of It? 175.
- Conventions: United Danish Church, 272; Lutheran World Convention and Dr. Hein, 146.
- Convictions are Needed, 302.
- Crime Situation in Chicago, 26; Accountability of Criminals, 88.
- Criticism, Misdirected, 118.
- "Cross" in Popular Hymns, 248. 249.
- "Crowd Mind," the, a Safe Guide? 218.
- Dancing, Evils of, 150.
- Darkness, Spiritual, 150.
- Death Penalty, 246.
- Delk's Theological Position, 172.
- Divorce, Ground for, 208.
- Education and Religion, 173; Parents and Education of Their Children, 276; Educational Methods of Dr. Eliot, 54.
- Educational Institutions. Theological Position of Princeton Seminary, 46; Modernism at Union Seminary, 48; Who Rules Smith College? 312; Concordia College, Adelaide, 302.
- Eliot's Educational Methods, 54.
- Episcopalians, Fellowship of Uncongenial Minds, 213.
- Evolution, Religion of Self-Worship, 119; Doctrine of "Evolution Itself in Process of Evolution," 268; Archeology against Evolution, 25; Reconciling Christianity and Evolution, 214; Evolution on the Retreat, 56; Beating a Retreat, 311; Questions which Evolution Cannot Answer, 88; Preventing Spread of Anti-Evolution Legislation, 87.
- Exegetical Paper, 1 Tim. 2, 11—15, 225.
- Exorcism in India, 85.
- Faith Healing, 307.
- Farce, 207.
- Fatherhood of God "Most Impossible Thing to Believe," 313.
- Fellowship of Uncongenial Minds, 213.
- Floods and God, 217.
- Foreword, 1.
- Fosdick Provided for, 179; "Modern Use of the Bible," 21.
- Fundamentalism, Nature of, 84; Parish Schools, 243; Fundamentalistic Convention, 245.
- Gerberding, Dr. G. H., Deceased, 206.
- Giving, 1 Tim. 6, 17. 18. 336.
- God; Cosmological Argument, 20. 21.
- Heathenism, Back to, 55.
- Heresy, the Glamor of, 55.
- Home, Threatening the American, 379.
- India, Back to Heathenism, 55; Exorcism, 85.
- Indians in the United States, 269.
- Indoctrination, Lowering Standards of, 129.
- Inscrutable Things, 309.
- Inspiration, Verbal, 18.
- Intersynodical Relations, 17.
- Jack's, Dr., Religion, 341.

- Jacobs, Dr. C. M., and the Scriptures, 204.
- Judaism, Masonry, Lutheranism, 74.
- Language, Importance of German and Latin, for Lutheran Ministers, 16.
- Laws, Immutable Social, 53.
- Liberalists, Theirs Is an Impossible Faith, 313.
- Literature, How to Remain Abreast of the Times in Knowing Theological Literature, 262.
- Loyalty to One's Official Creed, 305.
- Luther's Ninety-five Theses, 295.
- 330; Why was Luther Detained at Worms? 321. 365.
- Lutheranism, Early Swedish, 78.
- Lutheran Church, Status of Laymen, 268.
- Lutherans at Lausanne, 353.
- Machen *versus* Zwingli and Calvin, 248; Status at Princeton, 270. 305.
- Marriage, Annulment, 24. 25.
- Martyrs to Errors, 273.
- Mary's Assumption a Dogma? 340.
- Masonry and Mormonism, 89. Masonry, Judaism, and Lutheranism, 74; Eastern Star, 84; Masonic Divorce, 148.
- Mennonites Emigrating, 48. 273.
- Minister, The, and His Time, 178; Helpful Hints, 272; Can Sermon Preparation be Dispensed with? 309; How Much of His Time Should be Given to Community Interests? 51.
- Mission Opportunities in Cities, 336.
- Modernism at Union Seminary, 48; Logical Goal of Modernism, 21; Do Modernists Play Fair? 65; Modernists and Missions, 83.
- Mormonism and Masonry, 89.
- "New Psychology" 57.
- Pan-Babylonists, Fallacy of, 275.
- Pfeiffer, Dr. Edward, Deceased, 78.
- Phenician Alphabet, 56.
- Phipps Bill, the, 119.
- Prayer *ex Corde*, 3; Prayer a Means of Grace? 308; Praying-wheel "Christianized," 120; Pulpit Prayers without Christ, 250.
- Presbyterians Raise Fifteen Millions, 269.
- Pretheological and Theological Training, 378.
- Prophetess, Paraphernalia of a, 310.
- Publications, War on Immoral, 90.
- Reed-Curtis Bill Condemned, 52.
- Religion. What is Religion? 19; Inge's View on the Permanency of Religion, 24; Religion and Education, 173; a Victory for Religious Instruction, 206; a Farce Religion, 207.
- Remensnyder, Dr. J. B., Deceased, 78.
- Rice, Dr. M. S., 148.
- Rome. Annulment of Marriage, 24. Missions, 307; Candidate of the Holy See, 213; if Romanists not Semi-Pelagians, What Then? 211; Is the Bishop of Fargo Subject to the Pope? 342; Church History According to Rome, 342.
- Russia, the Gospel in, 304.
- Schools: Day-school a Better Way, 174; Vacation-schools of Religion, 103; Parish Schools and Fundamentalism, 243.
- Science and the Truth of the Bible, 215; Unwilling Discoveries, 20; Dr. Milliken on Scientific Research, 314.
- Scriptures. Give them a Chance, 173; Dr. Jacobs and the Scriptures, 204.
- Sermon, a Great, 243.
- Shallowness in American Life, 338.
- Sin, 51.
- Smith, Rev. Frank Edwin, 242.
- Soederblom True to Form, 304; the *Lutheran* on Soederblom, 117.
- Souls; Winning Them for Christ, 145.
- Spiritism, Mysterious Element in, 274.
- Stage, What is Going on on the, 182.
- Sunday Evening Services, 218; Special Sundays, 23.
- Synoptic Problem and Relation of First Three Evangelists to St. John, 257.
- Theses Drawn up by Representatives of Iowa, Ohio, Buffalo, and Norwegian Synods, 112.
- Titus 1, 12 Still True, 278.
- Tombs, Evidences from Greek Tombs, 40.
- Training, Pretheological, 378.
- U. L. C. Good News, 146; Amalgamation of U. L. C. Synods in New York, 303.
- Universalists Are Unitarians, 344.
- Unionism or Not? 17.
- Wallace, General, and *Ben Hur*, 50.
- War, the Peasants' War of 1626, 47.
- Water from the Rock, 23.
- "World without End," 265.
- Women. Clergywomen, 248; Dr. Straton and Preaching Women, 54.
- Youth of the Church, 45; Youth Movements, 22; Spiritual Care of the Young People, 289.
- Zionists in Palestine, 270.



“SOUNDING JOY.”

This collection of Christmas anthems, arranged for mixed voices, is recommended for the approaching holiday season. The compiler, Mr. Walter Wismar, has selected forty-two favorite and classic Christmas carols, many of which have delighted the hearts of young and old for generations. Some of the best-known composers are represented — Bach, Haendel, Mendelssohn, Crueger, Gruber, Praetorius, and others.

Church choirs especially will welcome this collection, as church concerts at Christmas-time are gaining in favor, and also because of the fact that congregations respond much more readily to an old-time favorite Christmas hymn than to the lengthy and more difficult selections that are sometimes rendered during the Christmas service. It has also become a laudable practise for our young people to go caroling in the community and in institutions. The collection lends itself well for this purpose. Young people's societies find much pleasure in singing the songs of their childhood days, and here again this collection will render good service.

Price, 35 cts. a copy, postpaid; dozen, \$3.36, plus postage; hundred, \$23.00, plus postage.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,
3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.





GLAD HOSANNAS.

A Collection of Sixty-Three Christmas Chorals and Carols.

By WALTER WISMAR.

To be compelled to select a dozen suitable Christmas-songs from about as many different collections frequently has been the disagreeable experience of those arranging Christmas programs for children. And after the selections were made, there arose the problem of putting them into the hands of the children. Those who have labored under such and similar difficulties will appreciate this new collection of chorals and carols that are published in handy form. Among the sixty-three selections there are twenty arranged for two-part and five for two-and-three-part singing.

To say that Walter Wismar has compiled the collection is to stamp it as one that contains choice selections, a fact borne out by the names of the following composers that are represented: Haendel, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Schumann, Bortnianski, Gruber, Crueger, and Praetorius.

The booklet measures 6×9 and contains 72 pages, which are sewed into substantial flexible paper covers. The special Christmas design printed in green on the red-colored front cover gives the booklet a cheerful holiday aspect. Price, 35 cts. the copy; 25 cts. in dozen lots; 20 cts. in hundred lots.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,
3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

